APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/606,089	06/25/2003	Brian S. Christian	MS1-1512US	4285

			EXAMINER
22801	7590	02/15/2006	WILLIAMS, JEFFERY L

LEE & HAYES PLLC
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500
SPOKANE, WA 99201

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2137	

DATE MAILED: 02/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/606,089	CHRISTIAN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jeffery Williams	2137	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>*25 June 2003*</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-28* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-28* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *25 June 2003* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

1   **DETAILED ACTION**

2

3   Claims 1 – 28 are pending. ·

4

5   *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

6

7   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

8   The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
9   claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
10
11   **Claims 2, 3, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as**

12   **being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject**

13   **matter which applicant regards as the invention.**

14

15   Claims 2, 3, and 5 each recites the limitation "the declaration module". There is

16   insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For the purpose of

17   examination, the examiner will presume the applicant to mean "the declarative module".

18

19

20   *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

21

22   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

23   form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

24   A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

1
2
3
4

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5   **Claims 1 – 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by**

6   **Scott et al. (Scott), "Abstracting Application-Level Web Security".**

7

8   Regarding claim 1, Scott discloses:

9   *receiving data input through a web page from a client device* (fig. 1, page 2, col.

10   *1, par. 3-6); referencing a declarative module to determine a client input security screen*

11   *to apply to the data input from the client device; and applying the client input security*

12   *screen to the data input from the client device* (page 3, col. 2, par. 2).

13

14   Regarding claims 2, Scott discloses:

15   *a global section that includes at least one client input security screen that applies*

16   *to any type of client input value* (fig. 2; page 6, col. 1, par. 1, 2, par. 2, lines 9-13). Scott

17   discloses a input security screen that applied to all user input (parameters values).

18

19   Regarding claim 3, Scott discloses:

20   *an individual values section that includes at least one client input security screen*

21   *that applies to a particular type of client input value* (fig. 2; page 4, col. 1, par. 4).

22

23   Regarding claim 4, Scott discloses:

24   *wherein the particular type of client input value is one of the following types of*

25   *client input values: query string; server variable; form value; cookie* (fig. 2).

1

2   Regarding claim 5, Scott discloses:

3   *wherein the declaration module further comprises a web.config file* (page 1, col.

4   2, par.3; page 3, col. 2, par. 1).

5

6   Regarding claim 6, Scott discloses:

7   *wherein the applying the client input security screen further comprises executing*

8   *a default action on invalid client input detected by the client input security screen* (page

9   3, col. 2, par. 1, lines 8-13, par. 2, lines 5-11; page 4, col. 2, par. 3,4). Scott discloses

10   the application of several types of input screening to all input data (default screening)

11   wherein actions are performed on the all the input data during the process of data input

12   security screening. Additionally, Scott discloses default transformations that can be

13   applied during the screening of invalid input data.

14

15   Regarding claim 7, Scott discloses:

16   *wherein the applying the client input security screen further comprises executing*

17   *a specified action on invalid client input detected by the client input security screen, the*

18   *specified action being specified in the client input security screen* (page 4, col. 1, par. 4-

19   6).

20

21   Regarding claim 8, Scott discloses:

1   *wherein a client input security screen further comprises one or more values that*

2   *may be entered as client input, the one or more values further comprising the only*

3   *values that may be entered as client input* (page 4, col. 1, par. 4-6). Scott discloses a

4   security screen that constrains client input to a set of values, such as any integer: 0 – int

5   [length 4]. Thus, the security screen effectively comprises the values of 0 – int [length

6   4] to be imposed upon the client input as a restriction. Additionally, Scott discloses that

7   the security screen comprises specific URL values (extracted from HTTP requests) that

8   may be entered as client input (page 6, col. 2, par. 1).

9

10   Regarding claim 9, Scott discloses:

11   *wherein a client input security screen further comprises one or more screened*

12   *values that, when detected in the client input, cause an action to be taken on the client*

13   *input* (fig. 4; page 3, col. 2, par. 2; page 4, col. 2, par. 3).

14

15   Regarding claim 10, Scott discloses:

16   *wherein the action to be taken further comprises removing the one or more*

17   *screened values detected in the client input* (fig. 4; page 3, col. 2, par. 2; page 4, col. 2,

18   par. 3, 4). Scott discloses the encoding of screened values (removal and replacement).

19   Additionally, Scott discloses the removal of values from client input based upon the

20   client input security screen (page 7, col. 2, par. 1.1 – 1.2)

21

22   Regarding claim 11, Scott discloses:

1   *wherein the action to be taken further comprises removing an entire string that*

2   *contains the one or more screened values detected in the client input* (page 6, col. 2,

3   par. 3; fig. 5; page 9, col. 1, par. 2.2).

4

5   Regarding claim 12, it is the system claim corresponding to the method claim 1,

6   and is rejected for, at least, the same reasons, and furthermore because Scott

7   discloses:

8   *a web page server unit configured to provide one or more web pages to one or*

9   *more client devices over a distributed network* (fig. 1).

10

11   Regarding claims 13 – 15, they are rejected for, at least, the same reasons as

12   claims 1 – 3, and 12.

13

14   Regarding claim 16, Scott discloses:

15   *wherein a screening rule further comprises a client input variable that may be*

16   *accepted as input from a client* (fig. 5). Scott discloses various screening rules that

17   accept client input variables.

18

19   Regarding claim 17, Scott discloses:

20   *wherein a screening rule further comprises one or more screened characters*

21   *that, when detected in client input, are screened from the client input according to a*

22   *screening rule* (fig. 5 – see transformation).

Regarding claim 18, Scott discloses:

wherein the screening rule further comprises a default screening action that is

applied in the absence of a specified screening action (fig. 5 – see transformation).

Scott discloses a single screening action that is to be performed, and thus, a default

screening action.

Regarding claim 19, Scott discloses:

wherein the screening rule further comprises a specified screening action that is

applied to the screened client input (fig. 5 – see transformation). Scott discloses a

single specific screening action that is to be performed.

Regarding claim 20, it is rejected for, at least, the same reasons as claim 5.

Regarding claim 21, Scott discloses:

serving a web page to a client over a distributed network; receiving client input

via the web page (fig. 1, page 2, col. 1, par. 3-6); *comparing the client input with one or*

more client input security screens stored in a security declaration module; if invalid

client input is detected, performing a screening action on the invalid client input as

indicated by the security declaration module (page 3, col. 2, par. 2; page 4, col. 2, par.

3; page 6, col. 1, par. 1, 2; fig. 5); *and wherein the one or more input security screens*

1   *included in the security declaration module can be applied to multiple web pages* (page

2   4, col. 1, par. 2).

3   Furthermore, Scott discloses a computer system, and thus discloses media and

4   instructions (fig. 1).

5

6   Regarding claims 22 – 25, they are the media and instruction claims

7   corresponding to the method and system claims of 2, 3, 5 – 7, 18, and 19, and they are

8   rejected for, at least, the same reasons.

9

10   Regarding claim *26*, Scott discloses:

11   *wherein the screening action further comprises a default action that is not*

12   *required to be specified in a client input security screen* (page 6, col. 1, par. 1, 2).

13

14   Regarding claims *27* and *28*, Scott discloses:

15   *wherein the multiple web pages are included in a web project* and *wherein the*

16   *multiple web pages are included in a web-based application* (Abstract; Introduction; fig.

17   1; section 3.1; page 4, col. 1, par. 2; page 6, col. 1, par. 2, col. 2, par. 1).   Scott

18   discloses a security policy to be applied to a large web-application, the policy

19   comprising rules for the web pages of a site. The web pages are associated with a web

20   application, thus, they are included in a web project/application.

21

22

1   *Conclusion*

2

3   Claims 1 – 28 are rejected.

4

5   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

6   applicant's disclosure:

7

8   *See Notice of References Cited*

9

10   A shortened statutory period for reply is set to expire **3** months (not less than 90

11 days) from the mailing date of this communication.

12   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

13 examiner should be directed to Jeffery Williams whose telephone number is (571) 272-

14 7965. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

15   If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

16 supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone

17 number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703)

18 872-9306.

1   Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

2   Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

3   published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

4   Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

5   For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

6   you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

7   Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

8

9
10   Jeffery Williams
11   Assistant Examiner
12   Art Unit 2137
13